

**FTC 01-A04
CONSTRUCT OFFICE BUILDING #25
FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER
ARTESIA, NM**

**SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER
PROCUREMENT DIVISION
BUILDING 93
GLYNCO, GEORGIA 31524**

FIXED PRICE CONSTRUCTION
PART IV REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No.	Clause Title	Page No.
M.1	Evaluation of Proposals	M-1
M.2	Relationship Between Price and Technical Strength	M-1
M.3	Elements of the Evaluation Process	M-1
M.4	Evaluation Criteria	M-2
M.5	Proposal Evaluation	M-6
M.6	Contract Award	M-6

M.1 Evaluation of Proposals

This section is intended to explain the rational and precise criteria by which proposals resulting from this solicitation will be evaluated. Offerors are advised that their proposal must contain sufficient information to allow a complete evaluation of the elements defined herein.

- (a) The “Best Value Continuum”: The “best value continuum” (FAR 15.101) will be utilized in this procurement for the evaluation of offers and the selection of the successful offeror to receive the award. The ~~A~~Source Selection Objective~~@~~ (FAR 15.302) is to select the proposals that represent the best value. The ~~A~~best value continuum is a method of evaluating cost/price and other factors specified in the RFP with the objective of selecting the offeror with the best overall proposal based primarily upon technical merits with costs and other factors considered as appropriate. The best value continuum provides the opportunity for cost/technical tradeoffs; therefore, award of a resulting contract will not necessarily be made to the lowest priced offer or the highest ranked technical offer.
- (b) Proposals shall be evaluated against the standards set forth in the RFP, without regard for the relative strengths and weaknesses of competing proposals.

M.2 Relationship Between Price and Technical Strength

Offerors are advised that in Proposal evaluation paramount consideration shall be given to technical proposals rather than price.

M.3 Elements of the Evaluation Process

- (a) Identifying unclear or ambiguous proposal provisions: Language in a proposal may at times be ambiguous and the proposal’s merit will depend on which of the possible meanings is given. In other instances, proposal language may simply be unclear, and the evaluators may be unable to understand it well enough without guessing at its meaning. In instances of ambiguity, the evaluators must indicate the alternate meanings that the language could be given. The evaluators must advise the Contracting Officer when they find they cannot make a sound evaluation because proposal language is ambiguous or cannot be fully understood. Clarification may be obtained from the Offeror, by the contracting officer, provided the clarification would not entail so substantial a revision of the proposal as to amount to the submission of an entirely new proposal by the Offeror in question.
- (b) Identifying instances, in which the Offeror has failed to provide adequate information: An Offeror will sometimes describe, in general terms, a particular approach for performing some part of the contract, but will not provide enough detailed information to permit an evaluation of its feasibility and merit. Each instance where this occurs will be identified, wherein the Offeror may be advised that additional information is required to permit sound evaluation. Clarification may be obtained from the Offeror, by the contracting officer, provided the clarification would not entail so substantial a revision of the proposal as to amount to the submission of an entirely

new proposal by the Offeror in question.

- (c) Identifying strengths and weaknesses of proposals: Evaluations will identify strengths and weaknesses of the technical aspects of proposals.
- (d) Identifying deficiencies in proposals: Evaluations will identify areas in any proposal that does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP and/or render the proposal unacceptable. A determination of unacceptable will be based on poor or unsatisfactory past performance of similar work. For each deficiency identified, the evaluation will note an explanation as to why one or more of the requirements were not met, an assessment (with supporting rationale) as to whether the deficiency can be remedied by the Offeror and, an assessment (with supporting rationale) as to whether the deficiency, assuming it is technically feasible, would entail so substantial a revision of the proposal as to amount to the submission of an entirely new proposal by the Offeror in question.

M.4 Evaluation Criteria

(a) There are three (3) elements to the Technical Evaluation Criteria: The Government evaluation standards are outlined for each element and listed in descending order of importance. Specifically, Factor one (1) is more important than Factor two (2), and three (3). Factor two (2) and Factor three (3) are equal, however Subfactor A in Factor two (2) is more important than subfactor B and subfactor A in Factor three (3) is more important than Subfactor B. The selection of the successful contractor will be based on the “best value continuum.” The Source Selection Authority will select for purposes of award the best overall proposal, based primarily upon technical merits, with costs and other factors considered as appropriate.

A. EVALUATION CRITERIA ELEMENTS

- 1. Organization, Management, and Technical Approach**
 - A. Management/Technical Capabilities** **25 Points**
 - B. Quality Control** **25 Points**
- 2. Experience**
 - A. Firms** **15 Points**
 - B. Key Personnel** **10 Points**
- 3. Past Performance**
 - A. Firms** **15 Points**
 - B. Key Personnel** **10 Points**
- 4. Section 508 Compliance** **0 Points**

1. Organization, Management, and Technical Approach.

- a. Management/Technical Capabilities**
- b. Quality Control**

a. Subfactor- Management/Technical Capabilities

Description: This factor considers the Offeror's plan for accomplishing this project. Each Offeror shall submit a plan consisting of a narrative explanation of his/her description of their proposed on-site approach to project management, coordination, technical capabilities, safety, submittals, quality control, value engineering, difficult activities, cost control (change orders-how they are proposed and tracked), Request for Information (RFIs) and contract reports, and coordination with the owner. The Offeror must provide enough information to confirm that they have experience in utilizing the tools and techniques stated above in similar projects. References will be contacted and responses annotated.

Standard for Evaluation: The standard is met when the Offeror's detailed description demonstrates a thorough knowledge and capability of the firm to provide high quality management and coordination of all skills, trades and subcontractors, safety, submittals, technical capabilities, quality control, value engineering, difficult activities, cost control, scheduling, change order management, timely request for information, timely response to Request for Proposals (RFP), and proven communication and coordination skills with respect to owner and subcontractor issues. Extra consideration can be given to Offerors who solve problems or implemented special workable actions for unique situations.

All references contacted must give a satisfactory or better rating. References contacted should indicate that the projects have been completed by meeting or exceeding the customer's requirements as set forth in the construction contract documents (drawings and specifications). Key reference issues are the demonstrated experience of the contractor to successfully organize and manage the required resources to complete the construction project. This may be measured in terms of timely completion, compliance with established budget, and number of RFIs resulting in contractor request for change orders.

b. Subfactor- Quality Control

Description: This factor considers the Offeror's experience in developing and using a detailed Quality Control Plan. While a detailed QC Plan must be developed specifically for this project after award, this factor considers the Offeror's knowledge, experience and skills in preparing and executing QC Plans. Offerors shall submit references from three previous projects where a QC plan was specifically required, provided and utilized. The plan to be submitted for this project should be used as a tool to ensure that the work is performed in a rational sequence and that the material and quality of work meets or exceeds the requirements as defined in the specifications and drawings.

Standard for Evaluation: The standard is met when the Offeror has demonstrated through past experience their ability to prepare and enforce a quality control plan that encompasses submittals and submittal reviews, material certifications, and documentation that materials and workmanship meets or exceed the

specification requirements. This standard is met by providing three or more similar construction projects where a QC Program was developed and utilized to help insure a successful, timely completed project. References may be contacted and responses annotated. All references contacted must give a rating of satisfactory or better.

A.2. Experience

- a. Experience of Firm**
- b. Experience of Key Personnel**

a. Subfactor- Experience of Firm

Description: This factor considers the relevant and complexity of past experience of the firm. Each Offeror will be required to provide at least three contact persons. References will be contacted and responses annotated on the questionnaire which includes questions about the firm and key personnel. References other than those provided by the Offeror may be contacted and used in the evaluation.

Standard for Evaluation: The standard is met when, within the last five years, the offeror was the prime contractor on a minimum of three similar or more complex projects. All projects must have received a overall performance rating of satisfactory or better, and have been completed on time and within budget.

b. Subfactor- Experience of Key Personnel

Description: This subfactor considers the relevant experience, knowledge, and expertise of key individuals of the construction team who will be assigned directly to the project. Key personnel include at a minimum the Project Manager, Field Superintendent and Quality Control Manager.

Standard for Evaluation: The standard is met when within the last five years, the individual has successfully completed two or more projects with a similar or more complex scope. References must provide favorable responses to questions on the questionnaire relevant to past performance of the firm. All projects must have been completed timely, within budget, and to the satisfaction of the owner.

A.3 Past Performance:

Subfactor

- a. Past Performance of Firm**
- b. Past Performance of Key Personnel**

a. Description Subfactor- Past Performance of Firm: This subfactor considers the quality of work and depth of relevant experience from the firms previously completed projects. Note, the Government is not limited to evaluating the projects submitted in the offerors technical proposal. Ongoing projects should be at or near the eighty (80%) percent completion level to be considered for evaluation. Per

FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), firms with no relevant experience and/or past performance history may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

Each Offeror should provide information for at least three projects of similar size and scope for evaluation. References must be capable of providing first hand information to substantiate the satisfactory completion as well as the similarity of the referenced projects. References may be contacted and responses annotated on the questionnaire. References other than those provided by the offeror may be contacted and used in the evaluation. If the offeror is submitting a proposal as a joint venture, mentor-protégé or part of some type of partnering arrangement, firms composing the ~~A~~Offeror shall provide a minimum of three references each.

Standard for Evaluation: The standard is met when, within the last five years, the offeror was the prime contractor on a minimum of three similar or more complex projects. All projects must have received an overall performance rating of satisfactory or better, and have been completed on time and within budget, and to the satisfaction of the owner.

b. Subfactor- Past Performance of Key Personnel

Description: This subfactor considers the relevant experience, knowledge, and expertise of key individuals of the construction team who will be assigned directly to the project. Note, the Government is not limited to evaluating the projects submitted in the offerors technical proposal. Ongoing projects should be at or near the eighty (80%) percent completion level to be considered for evaluation. Per FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), firms with no relevant experience and/or past performance history may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

Key Personnel include, at a minimum, the Project Manager, Field Superintendent and Quality Control Manager. Each Offeror should provide information for each of the key personnel from at least two projects of similar size and scope for evaluation. References must be capable of providing first hand information to substantiate the satisfactory performance of the key individuals as well as the similarity of the referenced projects. References may be contacted and responses annotated on the questionnaire. References other than those provided by the offeror may be contacted and used in the evaluation. If the offeror is submitting key personnel not currently employed by the Offeror, past experience from other firms will be acceptable. Also, the Offeror should provide reference projects where the roles of the key personnel were similar to the roles proposed for this project .

Standard for evaluation: The standard is met when each of the key individuals has experience on at least two similar contracts in the last seven years, for at least 70 percent of the total project term, in the position or similar position he/she will fill on this project. Also, the references contacted must indicate that the key personnel completed their duties in a timely, professional manner.

The Project Manager must demonstrate a minimum of five years experience as a superintendent, inspector, QC Manager, project manager, and/or construction manager on ~~A~~similar or more complex construction projects.

Site Superintendent and Quality Control Manger must demonstrate a minimum of three years experience as a superintendent, inspector, QC Manager, project manager, or construction manager on Asimilar@or more complex construction projects.

A.4 Section 508 Compliance

The Offeror _____ complied _____ did not comply with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 508 IT Accessibility requirements.

Standard for evaluation: The standard is met when the items in the Section J “Electronic & Information Technology Accessibility Standards Evaluation spreadsheet meet the stated requirements. If the items cannot be met due to unavailability of Section 508 accessible products, the offeror must indicate such on the form or provide an item with the greatest degree of compliance.

M.5 Cost/Price Proposal Evaluation

For purposes of award the Source Selection Authority will select the best overall proposal based primarily upon technical merits with costs and other factors considered as appropriate. The price proposal shall include the total price of the construction, including material, labor, equipment, overhead, profit, general conditions, and other costs.

The Government will use cost and price analysis to evaluate the price proposal, to determine whether it is reasonable, in comparison to Government estimates, and to determine the Offeror’s understanding of the work and their ability to perform the contract. Cost/price proposals will be evaluated and considered by the Government after all technical evaluations have been completed.

M.6 Contract Award

(a) As a basis for award, price is of secondary consideration and will not be rated or scored. THEREFORE, THE GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO AWARD TO OTHER THAN THE LOWEST PROPOSED PRICE. However, the degree of importance of price as a factor could become greater depending upon the equality of the proposals for areas evaluated. The greater the equality of proposals, the more important price and other price factors become in selecting the best value to the Government. All offerors are cautioned that the Government reserves the right to award this contract without discussions.

END OF SECTION M